

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-14 have been examined. Claims 1-3, 6, 8-10 and 13 have been rejected. Applicants note with appreciation that claims 4-5, 7, 11-12 and 14 have been deemed to be directed toward allowable subject matter. No claims have been amended or cancelled and a new claim 15 has been added. Accordingly, claims 1-15 remain pending. Reconsideration and allowance of all pending claims are respectfully requested.

The Examiner has indicated that the application lacks a signed declaration and that Applicants are required to submit a new declaration. The declaration was in fact submitted on March 3, 2000 in a response to an earlier Notice to File Missing Parts. Receipt for the Declaration is confirmed by the returned postcard from the Patent Office. A copy of this Declaration and the postcard are submitted herewith.

For an Information Disclosure Statement that was filed on December 7, 2000, the Examiner indicates that some of the references listed on the accompanying Form 1449 were not provided. The return postcard for this Information Disclosure Statement confirms receipt of all the cited references. However, the references that have been listed as being not provided are being resubmitted herewith.

Claims 1-3 and 8-10 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over a combination of U.S. Patent No. 6,549,592 issued to Jones, et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,501,730 issued to Katsumoto. However, U.S. Patent No. 6,549,592 is co-assigned with the present application. Both that patent and the present application are assigned to Cisco Technology, Inc. Also, the present application was filed on December 21, 1999, after the November 29, 1999 effective date of certain changes to 35 U.S.C. § 103(c). See MPEP § 706.02(I)(1). The subject matter of the cited Jones patent and the claimed invention were owned by the same entity at the time of the invention. Accordingly, U.S. Patent No. 6,549,592 is not available as an obviousness reference. The basis for this rejection is therefore overcome and the rejection should be withdrawn.

Claims 6 and 13 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,549,592 in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,501,730, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,373,861 issued to Lee. The removal of the Jones reference also overcomes this rejection. Withdrawal is respectfully requested.

Claim 15 is newly submitted and supported by the application as originally filed.

Conclusion:

For the foregoing reasons, Applicant believes all the pending claims are in condition for allowance and should be passed to issue. If the Examiner feels that a telephone conference would in any way expedite the prosecution of the application, please do not hesitate to call the undersigned at (408) 446-8694.

Respectfully submitted,



Dan H. Lang
Reg. No. 38,531

RITTER, LANG & KAPLAN LLP
12930 Saratoga Ave., Suite D1
Saratoga, CA 95070
Tel: 408-446-8690
Fax: 408-446-8691